



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit
 Graeculus esuriens; in caelum, iusseris, ibit.
 In summa, non Maurus erat neque Sarmata nec Thrax
 qui sumpsit pinnas, mediis sed natus Athenis.

Of this passage of Juvenal, Lowell, in the Introduction to *The Biglow Papers*, First Series, made fine use, in speaking of the Yankee character:

New England was not so much a colony of a mother country, as a Hagar driven forth into the wilderness. The little self-exiled band which came hither in 1620 came, not to seek gold, but to found a democracy. They came that they might have the privilege to work and pray, to sit upon hard benches and listen to painful preachers as long as they would, yea, even unto thirty-seventhly, if the spirit so willed it. And surely, if the Greek might boast his Thermopylae, where three hundred men fell in resisting the Persian, we may well be proud of our Plymouth Rock, where a handful of men, women, and children not merely faced, but vanquished, winter, famine, the wilderness, and the yet more invincible *storge* that drew them back to the green isle far away. These found no lotus growing upon the surly shore, the taste of which could make them forget their little native Ithaca. . . .

As want was the prime foe these hardy exodists had to fortress themselves against, so it is little wonder if that traditional feud is long in wearing out of the stock. . . . Thrift was the first lesson in their horn-book, pointed out, letter by letter, by the lean finger of the hard schoolmistress, Necessity. Neither were those plump, rosy-gilled Englishmen that came hither, but a hard-faced, atrabilious, earnest-eyed race, stiff from long wrestling with the Lord in prayer, and who had taught Satan to dread the new Puritan hug. Add two hundred years' influence of soil, climate, and exposure, with its necessary result of idiosyncrasies, and we have the present Yankee, full of expedients, half-master of all trades, inventive in all but the beautiful, full of shifts, not yet capable of comfort, armed at all points against the old enemy Hunger, longanimous, good at patching, not so careful for what is best as for what will do, with a clasp to his purse and a button to his pocket, not skilled to build against Time, but against sore-pressing Need, accustomed to move the world with no *πῶς στῶ* but his own two feet, and no lever but his own long forecast. A strange hybrid, indeed, did circumstance beget, here in the New World, upon the old Puritan stock, and the earth never before saw such mystic-practicalism, such niggard-geniality, such calculating-fanaticism, such cast-iron-enthusiasm, such sour-faced humour, such close-fisted-generosity. This new *Graeculus esuriens* will make a living out of anything. He will invent new trades as well as new tools. His brain is his capital, and he will get education at all risks. Put him on Juan Fernandez, and he would make a spelling-book first, and a salt-pan afterwards. *In coelum, iusseris, ibit*,—or the other way either,—it is all one, so anything is to be got by it.

Long before Juvenal wrote, his idea was set forth by Plautus, in his *Stichus*, 625-627. Gelasimus, the parasitus, is angling for an invitation to dinner from Epignomus, lately returned from a successful trading voyage. At first Epignomus, teasing him, bids him come to dinner, *si artē poteris accubare* (619). The parasitus replies that he needs no more room than a *catellus*. Then, turning serious, and speaking plainly, Epignomus bids Gelasimus go *in carcerem*. The passage continues thus: GE. Quin, si iusseris, eo quoque ibo. EP. Di immortales! Hic quidem pol summam in

crucem cena aut prandio perduci potest. GE. Ita ingenium meumst: quicumvis depugno multo facilius quam cum fame. In a word, Gelasimus is the sort of person that in *Mostellaria* 354-361, Tranio, confronted, now that his older master has come back from his long absence, with the exposure of all his plans and with the punishment he has so richly merited, longs for (in 358 I use, for convenience, Leo's text):

Ecquis homo est qui facere argenti cupiat aliquantum lucri,
 qui hodie sese excruciari meam vicem possit pati?
 Ubi sunt isti plagipatidae, ferritribaces viri,
 vel isti qui hosticas trium nummum causa subeunt sub falas,
 ubi quinis aut denis hastis corpus transfigi solet?
 Eo dabo ei talentum primus qui in crucem excucurrerit,
 sed ea lege, ut offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia;
 ubi id erit factum, a me argentum petito praesentarium.

(To be concluded)

C. K.

HOMER AND THE STUDY OF GREEK

This paper is a continuation of an article, *A Year—or More—of Greek*, contributed to *The Classical Journal* 13.364-371 (February, 1918), in which the writer set forth a few of the more important reasons why the present system of teaching beginners in Greek should be revised to meet modern conditions. The sum and substance of the article was a plea for the abandonment of Xenophon for beginning work, and the substitution of Homer in his place. By this plan the student would be taught Homeric forms and constructions as a basis for future work, and would devote to the study of Homer the time which is now occupied by Xenophon. It is the purpose of the present paper to develop more in detail some of the most important reasons which make such a change desirable.

It is only fair to state that, although this idea of beginning Greek with the reading of Homer is original with the writer, it is not new. This was the regular method employed by the old Romans in teaching their boys Greek, and it was highly commended by that capable and judicious old schoolmaster, Quintilian, as the best possible plan. Since that time it has been used now and then by some of the world's ablest educators and scholars. It was thus that Joseph Scaliger taught himself Greek in Paris; and many more of the great scholars of the past learned their Greek through Homer. Herbart, who began a series of experiments in Switzerland, in 1797, employed this method with marked success in private tutoring. Later, he continued his experiments on a larger scale in the Teachers' Training College at Koenigsberg, with such good results that he was thoroughly convinced that this was the only suitable method of teaching beginning Greek. At his suggestion it was tried by Dissen, by Ferdinand Ranke, and by Hummel, all of whom were hearty in its praise; and, most important of all, by Ahrens, at Hanover, where it was used for thirty years (1850-1881), with great success, but was finally abandoned because of the lack of suitable text-books and because of the opposition of

other Gymnasias, which refused to adopt such a revolutionary plan. It has also been advocated occasionally, but without success, by other scholars and humanists, notably by Goethe, by Andrew Lang, and by Wilamowitz; but hitherto no systematic series of text-books has been issued which are so well adapted to carry the students through Homer and introduce them to Attic Greek as are the books which have been worked out in connection with Xenophon. It has become highly important that this lack be supplied, if possible, in order that this plan, which has been tried by several with such good success, may be tested on a wider scale, so that we may see whether it will succeed in the hands of the average teacher of beginning Greek. To make a fair test at least two or three text-books must be prepared. First and most important would be a beginner's book, based on Homer, and including suitable grammatical exercises. Next would be required an introduction to Attic Greek, containing a summary of its most important differences in form and syntax from Homeric Greek. These two would be absolutely essential. Additional text-books could be worked out, especially some which would prepare the way for an easier handling of one or more of the simpler plays of Euripides, or of some of the less difficult dialogues of Plato. Thus students would be prepared to strike immediately into the heart of Greek literature, instead of having to go a long way around, as at present.

As to the superiority of Homer over Xenophon, from the standpoint of literary values, and of interest for the average student, there can be no quarrel. It remains for us to investigate the relative advantages and demerits of each as mediums for teaching the language.

In the first place, it is essential that we disabuse our minds of the notion, once prevalent, but long since exploded, though still more or less consciously held by many, that the Attic dialect is the norm by which all other Greek is to be judged. Such an idea is utterly unscientific and ignores completely the modern historical point of view with respect to the development and growth of languages. Any period which has given birth to literary productions of surpassing merit and artistic excellence is justified by its own works; it contains its own linguistic standards and will richly repay those who take the trouble to study it. To call Homeric Greek anomalous and irregular, because it differs in some particulars from the Attic dialect, is as misleading as it would be to say that the language of Shakespeare is immature and eccentric because he does not write the same type of English as does George Ade or Stephen Leacock. As a matter of fact, the language of the Homeric poems is quite as finished, has quite as many virtues, and is quite as much of a norm for its period and style of composition as Xenophon is for his; and the different forms in Homer are no more aberrations on his part than those of Xenophon are marks of degeneracy in him. And Attic Greek, after all, is but one of a number of dialects, coming at neither end, but in the middle of the development, of the Greek language. It is rarely found pure in any

of the great authors, and in none of those who are suitable for beginners.

If we begin with Homer and obtain a good grounding in his language, the transition from that to later Greek is simple and natural and in accordance with well established laws, so that a student who once gets a grasp of the processes involved not only has acquired a valuable scientific point of view, but he might be untrue enough to the traditions of countless students of the past to find Greek grammar interesting.

Since most of us learned our Attic Greek first, when we came to Homeric Greek and found so many different forms, the feeling very naturally arose with many that Homer has many more forms than Attic Greek, and that they are more difficult. On the contrary, the Homeric forms are not only simpler and more transparent than the Attic and as a consequence more easily learned—many Attic forms have to be explained by a reference to the Homeric ones—, but the Homeric forms are considerably fewer in number.

If, for example, we consider the various forms assumed by the case-endings when fused with the stem of the word, we find that, all told, 83 Homeric forms of the noun and the adjective are to be learned, as against 106 Attic forms. But this is not all. Many forms in both Attic and Homeric Greek are so rare that it would be manifestly absurd to compel First Year students to memorize them. When we have omitted such sporadic forms, we find that students who begin with Homeric Greek need to learn only 53 forms as against 78 of the Attic. This means that it is necessary to memorize almost fifty per cent. more forms in order to be able to read the first four books of the *Anabasis* than it would be to read the first six books of the *Iliad*. Furthermore, if the student should not be compelled to memorize any form of the pronoun which does not occur on an average at least once in every two or three thousand verses, there would be fewer Homeric forms to be learned here also. The same is true of the verbs. The reflexive pronoun, for example, and the future passive and future optative of verbs are not found in Homer; the middle voice regularly retains the uncontracted forms of the endings (not in a part only, as in Attic Greek); and in many other ways the forms are simpler and more easily learned. In fact many books for beginners find it easier to teach Attic Greek by a constant reference to the earlier forms, which in many cases are the Homeric.

Many Atticists have maintained that the great number of irregularities in Homeric Greek would be an added difficulty to the beginner. It is true that they are troublesome, but not so troublesome as the considerably greater number of irregularities in Attic Greek. Anyone who will take the trouble to count them will find that the irregular formations in Attic Greek considerably outnumber those in Homer. There is not space here to catalogue the various irregularities, heteroclitics, metaplastic forms, etc., of Attic Greek, but the lists given in Kühner-Blass, or any other of the more elabo-

rate Greek Grammars, are enough to convince the most sceptical.

The whole system of contraction, which is regular at times, and the variations caused by it in the general rules of accent and quantity, all of which are so confusing and so difficult to the ordinary beginner, are so little used in Homer that they can very profitably be omitted, or else touched quite lightly, and the time thus saved can be invested elsewhere to much greater advantage.

In the field of syntax Homer is so much simpler than Xenophon that students ordinarily find him a great deal easier. Thus Homer lacks the articular infinitive; there are no long and involved passages in indirect discourse; many other strange and foreign characteristics of Attic Greek and Xenophon, all of which give a great deal of trouble to the ordinary beginner, are lacking.

That these elements all contribute to a quicker and an easier learning of Greek through Homer has been abundantly proved by experiments. Thus students who begin with Homer regularly read more Greek in the time devoted to him than do those who begin with Xenophon.

It has long been a commonly accepted myth that Homer has such an enormous vocabulary that students would have more than ordinary trouble with it. In fact, however, the vocabulary of Iliad 1-6 is no larger than that required for reading the Anabasis, and one can read the whole of the Homeric poems, including the Hymns, without having to learn many more words than he must learn to read Xenophon, and without having to learn as many words as are necessary for the reading of Plato.

There are, it is true, a great number of words in Homer which are used only once. The Iliad has 1,097 of these, the Odyssey 868, a total of 1,965¹. However, Xenophon has 3,021 such words², of which 433 are in the Anabasis, as compared with 266 (238, if we omit the Catalogue of Ships) in Iliad 1-6.

It is highly important, too, in gaining a vocabulary to learn words which will be used in other authors read later in the course, and to acquire, so far as possible, the more fundamental meanings of words from which their later uses are derived. Ahrens, who made a careful study of this problem, gives the palm to Homer here without question. According to him, the words in Homer are much nearer their fundamental meanings; they take on different shades of significance in the various later authors. If one wishes to obtain a clear grasp of Greek onomatology and semasiology, he should by all means begin with Homer; thus he would be prepared to see more readily the later turns in the meanings of words and phrases, which in many cases vary considerably in authors of the same period, and sometimes even in the same author. There are over 400 words in the Anabasis which either do not occur at all in Xenophon's other works, or are used in them with a

different signification. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, 160 ff., says:

It did not escape the notice of later Greeks that Xenophon's diction was very different from that of pure Attic writers, and there are still extant several remarks upon this point. . . . A busy man, living almost wholly abroad, devoted to country pursuits and the life of the camp, attached to the Lacedaemonian system of government, and detesting the Athenian, Xenophon must have lost much of the refined Atticism with which he was conversant in his youth. It is not only in the forms of words that he differs from Attic writers, but he also uses many terms altogether unknown to Attic prose and often assigns to Attic words a meaning not actually attached to them in the leading dialect.

We may note now the following Tables:

TABLE I

This table indicates the authors whose vocabularies have more words in common with Homer, Iliad 1-6, than with Xenophon, Anabasis entire. The figures show the excess.

<i>Author</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Hesiod	904	87	Aeschylus	524	309
Pindar	485	236	Sophocles	400	365
Bacchylides	347	73	Euripides	428	916
Elegiac and Iambic Poets	514	160	Aristophanes	148	612
			Theocritus	466	93

TABLE II

This table indicates the authors whose vocabularies have more words in common with Xenophon than with Homer, Iliad 1-6. The figures show the excess.

<i>Author</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Herodotus	100	799	Isocrates	371	514
Thucydides	371	645	Lucian	119	1,301
Plato	90	2,442	Plutarch	19	5,639
Demosthenes	366	1,379	Menander	176	102
Lysias	362	246	New Testament	209	543

The pages as given above are according to the Teubner texts. The number of words in Xenophon's Anabasis is approximately the same as that in Iliad 1-6.

In these lists, words which are closely enough related to others that ordinary students who know the meaning of one may infer the other are counted but once. Proper names are also omitted.

From these tables it will be seen that Homer is a much better preparation for the Greek drama, Hesiod, the elegiac and iambic poets, than is Xenophon, and it is along these lines that the course should be developed. For Plato the difference is so exceedingly slight that in the matter of vocabulary one is practically as good a preparation as the other, and a few of his easier dialogues should find a place after some of the best poetry has been read. After that the Greek course ought to be able to take care of itself. Herodotus might come at any point. There is a slight advantage here on the side of Xenophon in the matter of vocabulary, but Herodotus's language is so much closer to that of Homer, as

¹L. Friedländer, *Zwei Homerische Wörterverzeichnisse*.

²G. Sauppe, *Xenophon's Opera*, 5.298.

well as his general style and imaginative genius, that he would be very easy and stimulating to those who had read any considerable amount of Homeric Greek. Those who wish to read Thucydides and the orators would find Xenophon's vocabulary somewhat better for their purpose, and the same is true if they wish to read the New Testament and Menander, but in all these the advantage is relatively slight, and in most cases the difference would probably not be noticeable.

Some have urged that, since the bulk of the work in the ordinary College course in Greek is in the Attic dialect, students who begin with this would get a firmer grasp of it than if they began with Homer. Some even feel that a student who did his beginning work in Homeric forms would never be able to feel thoroughly at home in Attic Greek.

Yet few teachers would be rash enough to suggest that, because a student has had a thorough training in Attic Greek, he is thereby disqualified from doing first-class work in the language of the Hellenistic period, nor would many teachers of New Testament Greek object to a student who wished to specialize in their subject, or even in Patristic Greek, if he came to them with a good knowledge of Plato. Students who wish to specialize in Pliny and Tacitus, or even in Medieval Latin, do not find themselves handicapped because they did their earlier work in such authors as Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, and Catullus. Teachers of the Romance languages also universally recognize that a thorough course in Latin is a prerequisite for the highest type of scholarship in their field, and no student can hope to do advanced linguistic work in any of these languages without a thorough training in Latin. In the same way Homer offers an unexcelled preparation not only for all later Greek literature, but for the later language as well; and instead of the present system of confusion in the teaching of Greek grammar, particularly with reference to the various dialects, some attempt should be made to develop the subject in a more scientific fashion.

Some feel that Homer is too beautiful and too exquisite to be used as a corpus vile for the teaching of Greek grammar. But the fact that he is so beautiful and so exquisite is the very reason why he should be used at this early stage, that the students may have an added incentive for learning their grammar, and may not come to hate and despise the whole subject. Thus they may see, even from the beginning, that Greek is something worth working at, and they may have material so interesting that the necessary grammatical drill will not seem so much useless drudgery.

A highly important consideration in placing Homer before Xenophon in the curriculum is the fact that, as matters now stand, such a large percentage of our students never reaches Homer. The problem before us with regard to these students is whether we are to give them Xenophon *or* Homer. Since they represent a very large element, not all of whom are loafers, we owe it to ourselves and to the cause of Greek, as well as to them,

to give them that which will be of most lasting value to them.

Furthermore, Homer is interesting not only to older students, but is particularly adapted to the youngest who now take Greek, as the earliest experiments, made with boys from nine to fourteen years of age, have amply demonstrated. He serves the double purpose of introducing them adequately to the language and of furnishing them with reading material as interesting as can be found in any literature, something, too, of permanent value, and he should come by all means as early as possible in the course, that he may serve as a suitable basis for the development of those qualities of taste and appreciation without which the study of art is in vain. And after we have begun with him, we find his treasures inexhaustible. In Herbart's expressive phrase, "Homer elevates the student without depressing the teacher". Again, in his lectures on education, 6.283, he says:

'The reasons for giving the preference to Homer's *Odyssey* in early instruction are well known. Any one who reads the *Odyssey* carefully, with an eye to the various main classes of interest which are to be aroused by education, can discover the reasons. The point, however, to be gained here is not merely to produce a direct effect, but beyond that to get points of connection for progressive instruction. There can be no better preparation for ancient history than gaining interest for ancient Greece by the Homeric stories. The ground is prepared for both the cultivation of taste and the study of languages at the same time. . . .

The *Odyssey*, it is true, possesses no magic power to animate those who are entirely unsuccessful in languages, or who do not work at them seriously; nevertheless it surpasses in definite educative influence, as is proved by the experience of many years, every other work of classic times that could be chosen'.

In conclusion, the writer would earnestly suggest that it is high time that Xenophon be omitted completely from at least the first three years of Greek study. The time and the labor now devoted to both Xenophon and Homer should be spent on Homer alone, and for the three books of the *Iliad* and the four books of the *Anabasis* usually read should be substituted a course in Homer which would be extensive enough to give the students a real insight into his poetry, that they may learn to wander for themselves in the realms of gold, that they may be allowed to become so familiar with his language and his style that reading him will be a pleasure, that they may become so filled with his spirit that they may catch a glimpse of what it means to be Homeric, and, in later years, if they have gone out into other fields and would like to turn back to Greek literature, it would be a comparatively simple matter for them to bring out their old book and enter again with delight into his world of song. In the Secondary Schools we should have a course in Homer comprehensive enough to enable the students to obtain a firm grounding in his language and ideas, instead of the present smattering of both Xenophon and Homer, neither of which the average student knows well enough for it to serve as a stable and satisfactory basis for

future work. It would be a real step forward on the part of the Colleges, and should largely increase the number of those now offering Greek for admission, if the requirements in Greek should be made a requirement in Homer only, due attention being paid to composition and grammar, of course. Thus the Secondary Schools could concentrate their efforts on one dialect and on one homogeneous mass of literature, which would materially simplify their problems, and ought to produce a much higher grade of work than is possible at present. If Colleges would admit students on one, two, and three years, respectively, of Homer, with due credit for each, and reserve all work in the Attic dialect for the College course proper, the Secondary teachers would have their burdens greatly lightened, with a corresponding increase in effectiveness. In no other language do the Secondary Schools undertake to prepare a student in two separate dialects. To do so in Greek is a pedagogical blunder. CLYDE PHARR.

SOUTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY,
Clarksville, Tennessee.

REVIEW

Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the last Half-Century of the Roman Republic. By Richard Orlando Jolliffe. University of Chicago Dissertation. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company (1919). Pp. xi + 109.

The scope of Mr. Jolliffe's study may be clearly seen from the following condensed Table of Contents:

Introduction <ix-xi>.

Chapter I. The Army <1-32>.

1. Great power of Roman general.
 2. Embezzlement of the war-chest.
 3. Extortion of money from provincials for protection.
 4. Quartering of troops: its burdens and vexations. Note on Cic. ad Att. 4.19.2.
 5. Requisitions of equipment and supplies.
 6. Commissions in army eagerly coveted.
 7. Theory that booty belonged to state.
 8. Sale of services of Roman army.
- Excursus: The 'graft' of centurions in the sale of exemptions and furloughs.

Chapter II. The Navy <33-51>.

1. Burdens of service shifted to allies.
2. Amount of ship-tax left to discretion of governor.
3. <Verres alters> Sicilian system of supplying ships fully equipped, manned and maintained.
4. Embezzlement of pay and maintenance of discharged crews.
5. Sequestration of prize-money.
6. Excessive ship-tax imposed.
7. Sale of a vessel of the fleet to pirates.
8. Naval service used generally by Roman admirals as a source of personal gain.

Excursus: Estimate of Verres' profits from naval graft.

Chapter III. Client Princes <53-76>.

1. Advantage of Roman recognition and support.
2. Pleas for recognition addressed to senate. Bribery of senators.
3. Consuls especially open to corruption of this sort.
4. Provincial magistrates in a favorable position to exact rewards for real or promised support.
5. <Ariobarzanes> debts to Pompey and Brutus probably represent bribes.

6. Corruption of other magistrates.

7. The confiscation of Cyprus.

Chapter IV. Embassies <77-105>.

A: *Legatio Libera*

1. Generally devoted to purposes of gain.
2. Disability involved in time-limit fixed by applicant for the embassy.
3. Used in election campaigning and as a convenient pretext for absence.
4. Efforts at regulation.
5. Hospitality, exacted and voluntary.

B: Embassies and Commissions sent out from Rome.

6. Commissions with extraordinary powers.
7. The *vaticum*.
8. Embassies varied in opportunities afforded for personal profit.
9. Gifts to ambassadors.
10. Prestige of ambassadorship as a means of profit in private transactions.

C: Embassies to Rome.

11. Appeals for favors and relief presented to <senate> by embassies.
12. The consul's prerogative in introducing embassies to the senate.
13. Support of private members of senate and of influential citizens purchased.

Conclusion <107>.

Bibliography <108-109>.

After a glance at the topics the reader will agree with the author's admission in his Preface that, for the epoch under discussion, there is little "hope of making large discoveries or materially altering the general judgment of scholars". For Chapter III, on Client Princes, special indebtedness is acknowledged to P. C. Sands's essay, *The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic* (Cambridge, 1908), for Chapter IV, on Embassies, to A. A. Thurm's monograph, *De Romanorum Legatis Reipublicae Temporibus ad Exteras Nationes Missis* (Leipzig, 1883).

The purpose of the dissertation, therefore, as expressed in the Preface and in the Introduction (iii, ix), is to investigate the sources and to weigh anew the evidence in order to "illustrate one of the outstanding characteristics of Roman foreign administration". The last half-century of the Republic has been chosen (ix) because "the processes of government exhibit themselves not merely fully developed but already hastening to inevitable revolution", and because the period is "illuminated by a larger body of direct contemporary evidence than we possess for any other period of antiquity".

The author realizes (ix f.) that this evidence, which is, in the main, the political letters, orations, and treatises of Cicero, must be interpreted with allowances for political bias, for concessions to the claims of friendship, for personal rancors, for professional tone. Mr. Jolliffe has his own individual bias, however, in making these allowances. For instance, in §§ 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of Chapter II, which take up phases of corruption in the navy, the evidence is gathered almost exclusively from the Oration against Verres and is used for more than it is worth; Mr. Jolliffe has admitted (x) that the Orations are not so reliable as the Letters, and explains (39)